

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-18, and 20-24 are pending. Claim 16 has been canceled without prejudice. Claim 1, 6-7, 11-13, 17 and 20 have been amended, and new claims 23 and 24 have been added. Claim 23 is similar to original claim 9. Claim 24 contains language similar to that of original claim 14.

Claims 1-8, 10-16 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Piccini, EP 1 059 032. Reconsideration is requested.

The present application is directed to a wet wipe and a method in which a small quantity of a chemical blocking material is added to nonwoven fabric prior to saturation of the fabric with a lotion containing a cationic component. The chemical blocking material is believed to interact with the cellulose material in the nonwoven web to reduce or prevent chemical bonding of cationic lotion components during subsequent impregnation and storage of the wet wipe.

Piccini discloses a wet wipe that includes a non-acrylate binder in order to achieve desirable wet strength. According to column 6, paragraph 33, the binder is applied in an amount of 5-30% based on the dry weight of the fibers. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Piccini of using only 0.4-2.5 wt % of a "chemical blocking agent" (or binder). Piccini teaches away from using a small quantity of the binder, as a small quantity would not provide sufficient binding of the fibers.

Piccini does not disclose or suggest that small quantities of a chemical blocking agent (or binder) can be used to lessen the retention of a disinfectant. More specifically, there is no indication that 0.4% - 2.5% by weight of a material such as polyamide-epichlorohydrin resin would provide a benefit in reducing retention of a cationic lotion in a wet wipe. The relevance of the assertion in the Office Action that "it would have been obvious that the wipe retain about 10% less of cationic lotion . . . because the chemical agent is being **entrapped** by the fibers and a binder" is not

understood, as the present application is directed to a reduction in the retention of the lotion as a result of the presence of chemical blocking agent. The assertion in the Office Action appears to be that the presence of binder increases the retention or entrapment of the cationic lotion. Thus, Piccini does not render obvious claims 1-8, 10-16 and 21-22 of the present application. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Piccini. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 17 indicates that the upper limit for the chemical blocking material is 2.5%. The range of 0.4% to 2.5% of a chemical blocking material is neither disclosed nor suggested by Piccini. Furthermore, as indicated in response to the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-16 and 21-22, Piccini does not disclose or suggest a wet wipe that has reduced retention of a cationic lotion resulting from the use of a small quantity of a chemical blocking agent.

Claims 18 and 20 depend from claim 17 and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons as claim 17. There is no recognition in Piccini of using small quantities of a polyamide-epichlorohydrin resin in order to reduce the retention of a disinfectant on a wipe. Reconsideration is requested.

Application No. 10/518,180  
Amendment dated December 31, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of October 1, 2008

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Vaughan R. Annis et al.

By: *Diane F. Covello*  
Diane F. Covello  
Registration No. 34,164  
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: December 31, 2008  
750 Main Street, Suite 1400  
Hartford, CT 06103-2721  
Telephone: 860-527-9211  
Our Ref: AWL/116/PC/US  
DFC/eg